

Remarks

Claims 1-20 are pending, and claims 1-20 stand rejected. The Applicants have amended claims 1, 7, and 14 in this Response. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection set forth by the Examiner.

Claim Amendments

The Applicants have amended the independent claims to clarify that the special connection on the bearer network is established and at least a portion of the capacity of the special connection is reserved for transporting call signaling for low latency services. Support for this amendment may be found generally in the Summary and Detailed Description of the specification as filed. For instance, because call signaling for a low latency service is forwarded over the special connection, and call signaling that is not for a low latency service is forwarded over the signaling network, it is clear that a portion of the capacity of the special connection is reserved for transporting call signaling for low latency services.

35 USC § 102 Rejection

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-5, 7-11, and 14-18 under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,717,830 (Sigler). The Applicants submit that claims 1, 7, and 14 as amended are novel over Sigler for at least the following reasons.

First, claim 1 describes a wireless communication network comprised of a transport network that connects a base station system to a switching system. Because a base station system is recited, those skilled in the art will understand the wireless communication network to be a terrestrial network. Sigler does not describe a terrestrial network, but instead describes a satellite network. A satellite network does not include base station systems as they are understood in the art. As such, the Applicants submit that Sigler does not teach or suggest a wireless communication network having the elements recited in claim 1.

Secondly, the Applicants submit that Sigler does not teach or reasonably suggest a transport network having a bearer network with “a special connection... established and at least a portion of the capacity of the special connection is reserved for transporting call signaling for low latency services” as recited in claim 1. Sigler mentions in-band signaling over a bearer

connection, but there is no indication in Sigler that a special connection on the bearer network is reserved for transporting call signaling for low latency services.

Third, the Applicants submit that Sigler does not teach or reasonably suggest a base station system that “responsive to receiving call signaling from a mobile wireless device, determines if the call signaling is for a low latency service, forwards the call signaling over the special connection on the bearer network if the call signaling is for a low latency service, and forwards the call signaling over the signaling network if the call signaling is not for a low latency service”. As mentioned above, the Applicants submit that Sigler does not teach a base station system at all because it only describes satellite communications. The Applicant further submit that Sigler does not teach or suggest the functionality of receiving call signaling, determining whether the call signaling is for a low latency service, and forwarding the call signaling over two different paths (i.e., over the special connection or over the signaling network) based on whether the call signaling is for a low latency service.

In rejecting a base station system, the Examiner cites the Network Communication Controller (NCC) in Sigler. A base station system is understood to be a system that exchanges traffic with a mobile device over the air interface, and exchanges traffic with a switching system over a transport network (sometimes referred to as a backhaul network). The NCC in Sigler does not perform such a function. The NCC in Sigler controls the allocation of communication channels, but is not the interface between a mobile device and the rest of the network. The Applicants ask the Examiner to refer to the remarks made in the prior Response which further indicate the differences between the NCC in Sigler and a base station system.

Based on the above remarks, the Applicants submit that claims 1-5, 7-11, and 14-18 are novel over Sigler.

35 USC § 103 Rejection

The Examiner has rejected claims 6, 12-13, and 19-20 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Sigler and U.S. Patent publication 2002/0118665 (Cleveland). The Applicants submit that claims 6, 12-13, and 19-20 are non-obvious for at least the reasons provided above.

Conclusion

The Applicants submit that the pending claims are novel and non-obvious for at least the reasons provided above. The Applicants thus respectfully ask the Examiner to allow claims 1-20.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 10-8-2008

/BRETT BORNSEN/

SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER

Brett L. Bornsen, Reg. No. 46,566

Duft Bornsen & Fishman, LLP

Telephone: (303) 786-7687

Facsimile: (303) 786-7691

Customer Number: 50525